

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Puerto Rico and gone to Santo Domingo to raise once more the flag of his cause.

That might have given a fighting unity to his scattered and dispirited followers. As yet, however, he has not appeared where the bullets are flying and the issue is being decided.

The supreme point, which should be understood by everyone, is that the United States is not trying to overthrow the present government or keep it in power. It is not trying to restore Bosch as President or keep him in exile in Puerto Rico. It is not interfering in the internal politics of the Dominican Republic. Its political fate is to be settled by the Dominican people themselves.

Nor is the United States practicing intervention or imperialism in the sense so familiar to Latin America and so resented by it. It is a strange sort of intervention whose declared and single purpose is evacuation. The United States wants to get its citizens out of the Dominican Republic, not to get more troops in there.

But growing anarchy, the rising threat to American citizens, and the sinister designs of Communist power may give the United States no choice but reluctantly to increase its rescue operations.

Meanwhile every forward-looking leader in Latin America is being urged by the United States to use his influence to keep the Dominican Republic from sliding into anarchy or communism. The Organization of American States has decided to grapple with the crisis.

The Johnson administration seeks nothing for this country in the Dominican Republic and it stands ready to prove this, once conditions of law and order are restored and the Dominican people can shape their own national course without Communist domination.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 5, 1965]

INTERVENTION HAS OAS BASIS

(By David Lawrence)

Whether or not some of the countries in Latin America disapprove of the sending of U.S. military forces into the Dominican Republic, the realistic fact is that basic international law approves such rescue measures when the lives of foreigners are endangered and no other police force to protect them is available.

The Charter of the Organization of American States provides, in effect, that, where there is an established government capable of discharging its international obligations, "No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state." But this does not exclude intervention when the local government has broken down. The United States has openly declared that it has no desire to participate in the political affairs of the Dominican Republic.

There are indeed, even more pertinent articles in the Charter of the Organization of American States on this point. Articles 7 and 8 say:

"Every American state has the duty to respect the rights enjoyed by every other state in accordance with international law.

"The fundamental rights of states may not be impaired in any manner whatsoever."

These provisions are in complete accord with precedents of international law, which have always held that the lives of foreigners resident in a country must be protected against any violence and that, if the existing government is incapable of giving such protection, the state or states whose nationals are threatened may take appropriate action in defense.

Another article in the Charter provides that "the territory of a state is inviolable" and that "military occupation" or other measures of force must not be taken against

it even temporarily. The plain objective of such a provision, however, is to prevent territorial acquisition. The United States has no hostility toward the Dominican people and, of course, has no intention of annexing a single foot of territory or of interfering with a government once established.

Among the principles affirmed in the Charter of the Organization of American States are the following:

"International law is the standard of conduct of states in their reciprocal relations; "An act of aggression against one American state is an act of aggression against all the other American states."

In the present instance, the United States had detected an effort on the part of the Communist imperialist regimes to take over the Dominican Republic. This has precipitated a situation which not only endangers the lives of all foreigners, but also could extinguish self-government altogether in the Dominican Republic.

This means that the United States was obligated by the Charter of the Organization of American States to exert military as well as moral force against the aggressors.

There will always be a dispute as to how much evidence was available beforehand to the American Government concerning Communist infiltration. But there can be no doubt that a state of anarchy developed in Santo Domingo and that it was a wise precaution for President Johnson to order American marines to land, not only to protect American citizens but to prevent the injury of many innocent persons in the Dominican Republic who were in no way participants in the quarrels between the various factions.

By announcing at once that the United States would withdraw its forces as soon as the OAS could put into effect its own peace plan, President Johnson followed the procedures provided for in the Charter of the Organization of American States. The duty of a strong nation like the United States is clear. It must protect the weaker nations. If an emergency arises, it can act alone.

The proof of the sincerity of the Washington Government is to be found in its open declaration that it will join with other countries in the OAS to help preserve the independence of the Dominican Republic. For the really significant provision of the OAS Charter is its statement on collective security, which reads as follows:

"Every act of aggression by a state against the territorial integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State shall be considered an act of aggression against the other American States."

The U.S. action, therefore, is based upon two points—the protection of the lives of foreign nationals, and the preservation of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Dominican Republic against acts of aggression by imperialistic governments. This was the fundamental principle originally proclaimed in the Monroe Doctrine, and it has been preserved in essence in the Charter of the Organization of American States.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 6, our distinguished former colleague, Vice President HUMPHREY, delivered a most exciting and interesting speech to the Advertising Council. In the forthright and lucid manner which is so inimitably his, the Vice President spoke of the great goals we have for our land and the cooperation between business and Government which

is so necessary in order to build the Great Society. As he put it: "We have no little dreams; we make no little plans." HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke most eloquently of the hopes we have for a Great Society here at home and a peaceful and prosperous society abroad. I am sure all Senators will find his remarks of great interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY TO THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, APRIL 6, 1965

My friends in advertising should feel very much at home in the America of 1965.

Not merely because our economy is booming—and billings are up.

You—as representatives of an industry that lives by creativity—can feel at home because we are entering in this country the most creative and therefore rewarding period of our history.

America is creating new wealth—new and better goods and services, faster, for more people than ever before. But we are creating far more than that. We are creating in this country the means for sustained national growth. Not just economic growth. But a fuller growth which can keep us free and secure in the future.

We are improving and strengthening every major resource of this Nation—our educational system, our medical facilities, our housing, our recreation, and our most important resource, our people.

We are doing this through an unprecedented peacetime effort of national cooperation.

First, there is the creative partnership which now exists between Government and private industry.

We see this most dramatically at Cape Kennedy. Vital, creative work by Government, the aerospace and other industry will soon put Gemini Four into orbit. By 1970, Government and industry, working together, will land a man on the moon through project Apollo.

We see it too in Comsat—a unique corporation which fuses public and private enterprise. Comsat will revolutionize international communication.

We see it in Government economic and fiscal policies designed to give the private sector maximum latitude for enterprise and growth.

Thankfully, business and Government have passed the time when they regarded each other as natural enemies. You of the Advertising Council have demonstrated for many years the achievement in the public good which can flow from the great talent and resources of private enterprise.

There is a second and broader area of cooperation today in this country. This is the cooperation which is developing between others who once opposed each other as a matter of course—cooperation between North and South, Negro and white, farmer and city dweller, business and labor. There is another word for this developing cooperation. It is consensus.

Consensus is voluntary agreement based on constructive dialogue, mutual respect, and understanding.

In consensus today, we Americans are together joining the fight on old common enemies; poverty, disease, ignorance, discrimination.

9700

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 11, 1965

It is exhilarating. It is, in the words of the President:

"The excitement of becoming, always becoming, trying, probing, failing, resting, and trying again—but always trying and always gaining."

United we stand. And united we gain.

We must gain. Our needs are multiplying. In 5 years, 211 million people will live in our country—half of them under the age of 25.

In 10 years, we will need—each year—over 2 million new homes. We will need schools for 10 million additional children * * * welfare and health facilities for 5 million more people over the age of 60.

We have no time to lose. We must challenge the tasks at hand.

We must make our cities more livable—places where children can play and men and women can work, in safety and health.

We must preserve our natural heritage before it is lost * * * we must preserve our landscape and our forests. We must preserve clean air and water.

We must find ways to help our rural citizens adjust to technological revolution and social change.

We must solve the problem of mass transit. The commuters present in this room know what I'm talking about.

We have no little dreams. We make no little plans.

President Johnson has proposed—and your Congress is passing—legislation which will help create the freedom and security we seek.

Programs to provide adequate medical care, to better educate our children, to eradicate poverty, to give each man and woman in this country truly equal opportunity.

These investments carry a price tag.

But the cost per thousand or per man or per million of national problems like illiteracy, school dropouts, poverty, delinquency, and, yes, discrimination is far greater than the cost of our efforts to overcome these things.

We spend \$450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend \$1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, \$2,500 a year for a family on relief, and \$3,500 a year for an inmate in State prison.

We must make the investments necessary so that all in our society may be productive. Poor and uneducated people are poor consumers. They are a drain on our economy. They are wasted resources.

But beyond the economic good, there is the morality of our efforts.

We in America have always drawn strength from our belief that democracy can give the greatest reward of all: the opportunity for each man and woman to make something better of himself, in his own way. We believe in the dignity and worth of every man—not just our society as a whole, but each man in it.

That is why we educate a child, or give a hand to those without jobs or hope, or do the things we must do to insure that each American, whatever his color or national origin, shall have his equal chance.

We must do here at home the responsible tasks of freemen if we as Americans are to live up to our beliefs. I ask your support and your work for the programs which will make these things possible.

I also ask your support and work for something else: for the belief that the world need not destroy itself by war, and that we Americans can help others, too, in other places, find a better life. *

We hear many voices these days saying that America is overextended in the world * * * that other people's problems needn't be our problems * * * that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our fruits here in the good old U.S.A.

Too easy, my friends. And too dangerous. Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not?

Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not?

Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid or easy answers. We live in a time when we must exert our patience as never before. Have we the patience, for instance, to continue a disagreeable struggle thousands of miles from home—perhaps for months and years ahead—without any guarantee of final success?

I can tell you that the forces of totalitarianism have that patience.

We must stand abroad as we stand at home: for the pledges made by Americans who came before us. We must love freedom and justice enough to practice it * * * and defend it.

President Johnson has made his commitment to all of us. I join him in that commitment.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM XIV

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, university communities—faculties and student bodies—include a very substantial number of opponents of our southeast Asia policies. They properly reject Secretary of State Rusk's chiding of the academic world for what he chooses to label its "stubborn disregard of plain facts." A reply from New England university faculty members was published as a three-quarter page advertisement in last Sunday's New York Times. It points out their view that Secretary Rusk and the administration spokesmen are the ones who are guilty of "stubborn disregard of the facts."

The advertisement was signed by over 750 faculty members of 25 New England universities. Harvard leads the list, with 200 signers. Massachusetts Institute of Technology is second, with 137. Brandeis is third, with 69; Yale, fourth, with 62. Boston University has 46; Northeastern University and Tufts University, 43 each. Others are: Andover Newton Theological School, Boston College, Brown University, Clark University, College of the Holy Cross, Dartmouth College, Episcopal Theological School, Goddard College, Simmons College, Smith College, University of Connecticut, University of Vermont, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Cardinal Cushing College, Wellesley, Wheaton, Williams, and Amherst.

The list is an impressive one of outstanding faculty members, but I do not wish to burden the Public Printer by having the list printed in the RECORD. However, I do ask unanimous consent that the text of the message, entitled "A Reply to Secretary Rusk on Vietnam," be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1965]

A REPLY TO SECRETARY RUSK ON VIETNAM

In his address on April 23 before the American Society of International Law, Secretary of State Dean Rusk attacked academic critics of the administration for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam. He continued: "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to

learn—especially to learn how to think." This abusive language suggests that the administration wants to silence its critics.

This suggestion is confirmed by insinuations from other administration spokesmen about the loyalty of such critics. Precisely in this time of crisis, however, the academic community has both a right and an obligation to point out hazards and inconsistencies in our military and diplomatic policy.

It is easy to see why the Secretary of State is angry. The reasons have nothing to do with "gullibility" in the academic community. He is angry because the facts and wider considerations brought up by these critics have contradicted so many official pronouncements. It is not the scholars but the leaders of the administration who have shown a "stubborn disregard of plain facts."

PLAIN FACTS?

For example, on March 25, 1965, President Johnson said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia." But the "plain fact" is that the Geneva agreement did not provide for a division of Vietnam into two nations. On the contrary, the agreement spoke of the two parts of Vietnam as "regrouping zones" and said that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." It provided that " * * * general elections shall be held in July, 1956, under the supervision of an international commission * * *." No such unifying elections have been held. The Saigon regime, with United States approval, refused. Ever since, the United States has insisted that Vietnam remain divided.

On April 7, 1965, the President gave another description of the administration's goals. He said, "Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change," and further on: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." The plain fact is that the scale of American intervention is incompatible with the goal of self-determination. North Vietnam has, to be sure, intervened by helping the Vietcong. But at every stage of the war the scale of American intervention has been far greater. The manner of combat shows that we have saturated South Vietnam with every kind of military equipment the terrain allows. We airlift troops and supplies continually. We drop napalm on civilian populations intermingled with guerrillas. We burn and defoliate crops and forests. We have resorted to incapacitating gas. An intervention as massive as this does not furnish a choice to the people. It deprives them of one.

STUBBORN DISREGARD OF PLAIN FACTS?

If American actions in Vietnam are defensible, administration attempts to defend them should square with the plain facts. Self-deception about American intervention can be a greater peril than discriminating protest. Only by recognizing the ambiguities of the situation can we reach accord with the deepest levels of the American conscience and with the common conscience of mankind. The administration may have contrived the discreet silence or the grudging lip-service of some foreign governments and of some U.S. Senators, but the hazards and inconsistencies of the present policy are widely recognized both at home and abroad.

The situation in Vietnam raises serious moral questions, not merely diplomatic and tactical ones. As a nation we hold immense power. To permit it to be used in reckless and barbarous ways is to imperil the entire basis of American leadership.

May 11, 1965

Let us make known to the Government and to our compatriots that we oppose the disastrous policy of continued bombardment of North Vietnam. Continuation of the present policy makes it impossible for Americans and Russians to talk further about peaceful co-existence and encourages all Communist nations to close ranks in opposition to the United States.

World opinion does not support U.S. military operations in Vietnam. Throughout the world these operations appear increasingly to be a campaign in the self-interest of a Western power rather than in the interest of that stricken Asian nation. Indochina has been macerated by 20 years of anticolonial, nationalist, and Communist warfare. The United States has the military might to defeat the Vietcong. But unless we show immediate restraint, and show humane imagination in bringing interested parties to the peace table, we risk the loss of the respect and sympathy of men and nations far beyond the present theater of war.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Citizens must speak out on issues of national policy. We will not be intimidated by charges of gullibility or disloyalty.

We demand that the administration return to the plain facts and make an earnest attempt to obtain a negotiated peace. Reiteration of the phrase "unconditional discussions" is not enough, especially because the condition is attached to it that the rebel forces in the civil war are not to appear at the conference table. Peaceful intentions can be made plainer than this. We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal combatants, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we should use the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends; and we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the pursuit of peace.

Mr. GRUENING. Furthermore, Mr. President, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post, the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, commented on the New England situation. Writing from Boston, and under the headline, "Academics Oppose Johnson Policies," he pointed to the very considerable revolt taking place in our universities against the administration's policy in southeast Asia. He pointed out that while in voting strength the intellectual community may not amount to a great deal, nevertheless, over the years, this community has, on the whole, supported Democratic Presidents and has supplied ideas and initiatives. He added that this is an important function that cannot be scorned. Neither would it be safe for the administration to continue to disregard this very substantial opposition by the intellectual leaders of our Nation's life. The administration would do well to revise, first of all, the facts on which it bases its policies, so as to make them accord with history, and, on that basis, to revise the so-called unconditional discussions or negotiations which President Johnson proclaimed in his April 7 Johns Hopkins University address. Among the revisions should be, first of all, a recognition that the Geneva accords, a return to which the President has urged, provide for a reunited North and South Vietnam, not an independent South Vietnam; second, the revision should take cognizance of the fact that the United States, under the Eisenhower administration, invited itself to aid Viet-

nam militarily. The myth that an independent government of Vietnam asked us in, and that successive Presidents have pledged such aid on the basis of such a request, needs to be dispelled as a preliminary to realistic negotiations. As a third revision, there should be an understanding that there has been aggression on both sides. Our buildup of arms in South Vietnam was a violation of the Geneva agreement. That is spelled out in the report of the Commission created by that accord. The same is true of the violations by the North Vietnamese.

As a fourth revision, there should be a willingness to negotiate with the National Liberation Front—in other words, the Vietcong. Even if Hanoi should decide to yield, in response to our bombing of North Vietnam, the war would not cease. It has been, and still is, a civil war, although in response to vastly increased U.S. aid, North Vietnamese aid to the Vietcong has also increased.

I ask unanimous consent that Marquis Childs' article entitled "Academics Oppose Johnson Policies," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1965]

ACADEMICS OPPOSE JOHNSON POLICIES

(By Marquis Childs)

BOSTON.—For a President who dreamed of uniting the country behind his policies, Lyndon Johnson seems well on the way to dividing opinion along intensely partisan lines. In this center, with its 13 universities and colleges and the complex of new industries grown up around advanced research in these institutions, the division is strikingly evident.

The President's sudden action in sending marines into the Dominican Republic seems far more than the rapidly increasing American commitment in Vietnam to have aroused student opposition and the deep concern of the academic community. From the perspective of Boston it is possible to see two poles of opinion sharply alienated coming into being with attitudes hardening at each extreme.

At a "teach-in" at Boston University the other night, with most of the area colleges represented, an overflow crowd of 2,000 warmly applauded Barrington Moore, Jr., a Harvard sociologist, when he said: "We have to stop the enemies of freedom at home and, let's be blunt about it, Johnson is one of them. It is my careful and sober judgment that Johnson is one of the most dangerous men in politics today."

Turner A. Shelton, a spokesman for the State Department, got some cheers but far more boos and catcalls when he said, "If you're afraid to fight I don't know how to help you." At one point a faculty adviser took the microphone from Shelton to appeal to the students to allow Shelton to be heard.

More significant than this uproarious outpouring was the earlier "teach-in" at Harvard. By comparison, it was sober and, according to all reports, well balanced. Distinguished professors such as J. Kenneth Galbraith, a former Ambassador to India, analyzed the Johnson policy on Vietnam and while Galbraith and others opposed the bombing in North Vietnam they argued the case for sustaining a position of strength that would permit a negotiated settlement of the war. The unilateral intervention of the United States in a small, troubled Caribbean republic has been the trigger for a more unrestrained and vociferous reaction among students.

Faculty members with whom this reporter has talked speak with deep concern of the trend of American foreign policy. They see President Johnson resorting more and more to the emotional appeal of anticommunism to win support for his actions. As the recent past has shown, such an appeal gets a response from a large segment of opinion. But such an appeal, the fear is, will create a war psychosis defeating all hope of easing tensions and threatening a nuclear confrontation down a deadend road.

The memory of John F. Kennedy is strong. This is still Kennedy country. His academic admirers speak of his American University speech calling for a peaceful settlement of differences with the Soviet Union and the nuclear test ban treaty that followed as they ask whether the current promise set in motion is forever cut off.

On innumerable campuses across the country, judging by all reports, this same phenomenon is evident. The alienation of the intellectual community, if that is what is happening, can be easily discounted. A cartoon in the Boston Traveler summed it up—L.B.J. as an anguished Hercules holding the world on his shoulders while beatniks and the "better Red than dead" chip away at his ankles.

But among serious young students there is a genuine fear of what the intrusion of the Communist issue can do to student attitudes. They are especially concerned over the effort to brand certain phases of the civil rights movement as Communist-infiltrated or Communist-dominated and then linking this to the anti-Vietnam movement to discredit all student movements. It will harden attitudes, the belief is, and make it easier for the very small number of Marxist or Communist-oriented students to gain influence.

As a straw in the wind the Harvard Crimson editorial board was virtually unanimous in support of an editorial condemning the Dominican intervention while the board was divided, roughly 10 to 9, over a strong anti-Vietnam editorial last November. "The U.S. Government seems incapable of understanding that social reform, not communism, is the central concern of Latin Americans," the editorial said.

In voting strength the intellectual community is probably not more than 5 percent of the total, if it is that large. A practical politician can, therefore, dismiss it. But over the years this community has, on the whole, supported Democratic Presidents and supplied ideas and initiatives. This is an important function that cannot be scorned.

MESSAGE TO YOUTH DURING AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this past week I received a letter from Dr. Hyman B. Kaminkow, a distinguished educator in Baltimore city. Dr. Kaminkow is the principal of the Gwynns Falls Elementary School.

He has suggested to me that the President give an annual message to the youth of our Nation during American Education Week.

Mr. President, the concept of an annual message to the young people of this country is an appealing one. Adults talk about the importance of an education but little is done directly to explain to our youngsters the goals and aspirations of our society in terms of education.

A message from the President to the youth of our Nation will highlight the importance we place on this vital subject.

May 11, 1965

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD a copy of Dr. Kaminkow's letter to me and his letter of request to the President of the United States. I commend to my colleagues these thoughtful letters with the hope that they too might petition the President on behalf of this excellent suggestion:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GWINNS FALLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Baltimore, Md., April 27, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: In an address at the University of Michigan, May 22, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson said, "The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents." This statement reinforces my deep conviction of the urgent need of an annual presidential message to the children and youth of our Nation irrespective of the political party in office. Although I am aware of the tremendous beneficial impact of recently passed Federal legislation in the field of education, I am equally aware of the political, social, and economic climate of our time which makes the President's annual message to the children and youth of our Nation more appropriate today than at any other time. The Great Society needs the additional impact of an annual presidential message that would serve not only to motivate the children and youth to enrich their minds and to enlarge their talents, but to set a continuing example of our goals and standards for their future needs.

Should you find merit in the suggestion of the President's annual message to the children and youth of our Nation during American Education Week, then I would deeply appreciate the services of your office in effectuating its realization. I am hopeful that you will find it in the public interest to lend your support and cooperation to Mr. Allen Dale Olson, AEW coordinator, whose very warm reaction to my suggestion is amplified in his letter to me.

I extend my deep appreciation to you for your consideration of and response to this letter.

Sincerely,

HYMAN B. KAMINKOW,
Principal.

BALTIMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL No. 60,
Baltimore, Md., February 24, 1964.
President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During one of the 4 tragic days of the assassination of our late President John F. Kennedy, I was fortunate to view a rebroadcast of a special television program in which you were interviewed by a commentator on the LBJ ranch. I was impressed by the simplicity and cogency of your comments on national and international affairs. Your comments were so sincerely expressed that they gave meaning to the quotation, "Sincerity is the highest form of eloquence."

Of particular impact was the comment that the present generation is better than the previous one, and that the next generation will be better than the present one. This optimistic observation was significant to me because of its educational implications; it gave support, strength, and encouragement to the pursuit of our national goals. As Ralph McGill pointed out, "We cannot, any more than could past generations, see the face of the future. But we know that written across it is the word education."

The television program I experienced several months ago is still with me in some personal and professional reflections. In the past, every message by the President of the United States, if my memory serves me right, has been addressed to the adult citizenry. Has not the time arrived, Mr. President, when a "century of the educated man" talk be addressed to the children and youth of the elementary and secondary schools of our Nation—public, private, and parochial?

You, Mr. President, had once been a teacher. In my mind, you still are; only this time you're our "top teacher." And as our top teacher, Henry Adams would have said that you affect eternity because you never can tell where your influence will stop. It is in this light that I respectfully suggest an idea that would take the form, via radio and television, of the President's annual message to the children and youth of our nation. This message, I believe, could be addressed appropriately during American Education Week, a week when our children and youth need to be reminded of their unique opportunity to fulfill their responsibilities of both optimum self-realization and maximum contribution to our democratic society.

In conclusion, it is my hope that the teacher and politician become President of the United States will find merit in the idea suggested in this letter.

May God grant you a double portion of good health, strength, energy, and wisdom in the guidance and protection of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

HYMAN B. KAMINKOW,
Principal.

UNDER SECRETARY OF TREASURY PROMISES CONTINUANCE OF SOUND DEBT-MANAGEMENT POLICY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, public debt in the United States has often been a subject of concern for many of our citizens; and in recent months, members of the banking community and investing public have been especially interested in possible changes in debt-management policy that might result from the changes in Treasury Department personnel.

In an excellent statement before the Louisiana Bankers Association, the Hon. Joseph W. Barr, newly appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury and former Congressman from Indiana, outlined the development of debt-management policies since the Second World War and expressed the administration's desire to continue present policies in light of experience gained in recent years.

Under Secretary Barr pointed up the intricacies of the structural nature of the debt and the new techniques developed in the 1960's for meeting the difficulties—techniques which have helped to maintain a sound monetary system.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Barr's statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. JOSEPH W. BARR, UNDER
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE
LOUISIANA BANKERS ASSOCIATION, JUNG
HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 4, 1965

On April 1, 1965, Henry H. Fowler became Secretary of the Treasury. Two months earlier Frederick L. Deming became Under

Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs. On April 29 I assumed the office of the Under Secretary of the Treasury, and on the same date Merlyn N. Trued became Assistant Secretary for International Affairs. Some of you may wonder what these changes will mean in terms of policy developments—particularly in the area of debt management. Perhaps a brief report would be in order.

Secretary Fowler has already made clear his intention to build on the programs that have been taking shape in the last few years. This intention is particularly strong in the debt management area where so much progress has been made in recent years.

In the same way that Secretary Dillon and Under Secretary Roosa built upon the debt management policies initiated and developed by Secretary Anderson and Under Secretary Baird, I can promise that we will follow through along the lines laid down by our predecessors. The issues and problems that confront the Treasury—in taxation, debt management, gold, silver, or the balance of payments—all have a long life history. I know this from personal experience, having lived with a number of issues in the major areas of Treasury responsibility.

My first contact with the Treasury, other than that of being a taxpayer, was in 1959, when as a new Congressman I came over to the Treasury to meet some of the Treasury officials and staff members. My discussions with Secretary Anderson, Under Secretary Baird, and the Treasury staff alerted me to a developing problem that was to some extent threatening to get out of hand—the problem of managing the public debt.

In 1959 this was not an important problem in the public mind, but the Treasury was doing all it could to alert the country to it. As a result of those efforts, and the progress that has been made since then I am able to report now that public debt management is in excellent shape.

I developed immediate interest in 1959 in the debt management problem. The concern expressed about this problem by the Treasury at that time lead Representative MOORHEAD and myself to a series of meetings with Treasury officials and also to meetings in New York with participants in the Government securities market.

Treasury officials at that time were deeply concerned over the problem of how to properly manage our public debt, and were intensively exploring new techniques in this area. However, it was not until 1962 and 1963 that there was much public concern over the problem. This public concern was perhaps best exemplified by the fact that Congress passed three separate bills dealing with the debt limit instead of only a single piece of legislation to cover the year's requirements.

As I was in charge of Treasury's congressional liaison at that time I can testify to the irritation this caused Members of Congress. By the time the year was over Congress was not only heartily sick of the issue but so were we in the Treasury Department. However, by that time the Treasury was already well on the way to a satisfactory solution of the problem.

To understand how it was solved we should begin with the nature of the problem itself. In terms of its size the public debt has gone up \$59 billion since 1946. This seems like quite a startling increase until it is put into perspective with the rest of the economy. This debt increase represents a 23 percent rise, but since 1946 our population has grown some 35 percent so that on a per capita basis the debt is nearly \$200 less than it was at the end of World War II. The debt in 1946 was larger than our gross national product but today it is less than half of GNP. Similarly, during the same period, while the Federal debt went up 23 percent, private debts, the debts of individuals, businesses, State and local govern-

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9775

REA pattern has become an American export.

At a meeting which I attended earlier this month, President Johnson said:

For years, everyone wondered what there would be to do when all rural America had electricity. Well, I think now you have the answer—you are going to electrify the rest of the world.

I think this is a great statement about a great program by a great President. I cannot think of a better way to recognize the 30th anniversary of REA than to call attention to the way its experience is being put to such good use abroad.

The majority of REA borrowers are cooperatives, owned and directed by the rural people they serve. In many ways, this form of enterprise is ideally suited to the desperate needs of new nations just beginning to develop their economies. The notion that farmers and other rural people, totally inexperienced in running electric utilities, can make a success of their own electric system, is a revolutionary concept that has wide appeal. It is also a sound idea that promises a practical approach to stability and democratic methods.

Rural electrification projects in 20 countries are underway. These include not only our neighbors in Latin America, but also such additional staunch overseas friends as the Philippines and Thailand.

In this way, the successful techniques of U.S. rural electrification are being widely applied throughout the world, today. Direct application of the REA pattern already has established new rural electric cooperatives in Ecuador and Nicaragua. I think Congress can be proud of a homegrown program that is winning friends for us at the grassroots level overseas.

On the 30th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration, all Americans pay tribute to this successful program, which has contributed heavily to the progress of our great Nation.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on May 10, 1877, the nation of Rumania, after centuries of living under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks, declared its independence. Today, that nation is only one among many in Eastern Europe forming part of the vast Soviet system stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, for in August 1944, as World War II drew to a close, Soviet armies marched into Rumania, and stayed there, to insure the establishment of a Communist regime subservient to the Soviet Union.

In recent years, however, events have shown that the Soviet leaders sorely underestimated the determination of the Rumanian people to maintain an independent stance vis-a-vis their giant neighbor to the east and to the north, and to cling to the traditions that always have tied them to the West. The Rumanians have stubbornly resisted Soviet efforts to maintain them in the inferior position of a primarily agricultural country. They have sought help from Western countries in the building of industry.

They have banished Russian as a compulsory language in their schools. They have pursued an independent line in the Sino-Soviet dispute.

Undoubtedly, true independence still lies far ahead; but the first steps have been taken. It is my hope that, one day, the Rumanians will once more be able to observe their traditional independence day in freedom.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the 10th of May is a most significant anniversary for the Rumanian people. It is the commemoration of three great events in the history of that valiant nation. It is sad, however, that because of the Soviet domination of the Rumanian nation, this anniversary cannot be celebrated openly by the people of Rumania. However, those in exile do celebrate it. The Soviet Government has forcefully tried to eradicate all traces of Rumania's glorious past. Nevertheless, the Rumanian people throughout the world continue to observe this national holiday with great devotion, and continue to work toward their ultimate goal of restoring freedom to their homeland.

On May 10, 1866, the Rumanian dynasty was founded when Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a member of the Prussian royal family, was proclaimed Prince of Rumania. On May 10, 1877, Rumania proclaimed her independence from the Ottoman Empire. Another landmark in Rumanian history was reached on May 10, 1881, when she was recognized as a sovereign kingdom, and Charles was crowned her first King.

Now, however, the Rumanian nation is living under the repression of a foreign ruler. The Soviets have changed the national holiday from May 10 to May 9, the anniversary of the Soviet victory in World War II. Although the official celebration takes place on May 9, it is the traditional loyalty to their independence day, as celebrated on May 10, which warms the hearts of many Rumanians. Celebrations of the May 10 anniversary continue, secretly.

In commemorating this important event, we give the Rumanian people hope and inspiration that will help to enable them to maintain their efforts and to join the great fight against communism.

All Americans look to the day when Rumanians and other captive peoples will again have freedom.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Rumanian people constitute the largest ethnic group on southeastern Europe, in the Balkan peninsula. Some 19 million Rumanians constitute a formidable force in the Balkans today, as did their robust ancestors in the course of their past history. For centuries these tireless tillers of the soil held their own against powerful, ruthless, and aggressive invaders. But in the 15th century they were overcome by the Ottoman Turks; their country was overrun, and then made part of the Ottoman Empire.

During that long period, for nearly 400 years, Rumanians endured the crude, cruel and oppressive rule of the Ottoman Empire, and at the same time they did their utmost to cast off the alien yoke which weighed heavily upon them. Time and again they revolted and rose in

rebellion against their powerful overlords; time and again they were overpowered, and were severely punished for their attempts to free themselves. But the Rumanian people, firmly resolved to be free and independent, and unwilling to be held down, or held back from their national goal, revolted several times during the last century, and in at least of these uprisings they were successful.

In 1856, after the conclusion of the Crimean War, they obtained autonomous status within the Ottoman Empire, and for all practical purposes their only tie with their suzerain the Sultan was the payment of annual tribute to his treasury. But the Rumanians wanted to cut off this last remaining link between themselves and their former oppressors. To attain this goal they rose again in revolt in 1877, proclaimed their complete independence of Turkey on May 10, and started a war against the Turks. Fortunately for them in this war, they had the Russians as well as all other Balkan peoples on their side. And the victory of their cause was assured in 1878.

Thus May 10, 1877, and the events connected with that date, mark a veritable milestone in Rumanian national history. The proclamation of May 10 ushered in a new era in their national life, and made them a sovereign and independent nation. They then built and developed their country, made good use of its immense natural resources, and made Rumania the huge granary, the real "bread-basket" of Europe. Still later it was also to become the largest source of Europe's petroleum. Rumanians enjoyed the freedom as well as the prosperity of their country. But the two World Wars proved disastrous. In particular the last war was tragic to the Rumanian people. They suffered under the Nazis during that war, and since 1945 they have been held down by their powerful Communist neighbors the Russians.

It is the sad and inescapable fate of Rumanians to have the Soviet Union as their neighbor in the East. That geographical fact made Rumania the first victim of Soviet aggression early in 1945. Until very recently Rumanians have been held down with an iron hand by the agents of the Kremlin. In recent years, fortunately, Rumanians have taken full advantage of the apparent relaxation of Soviet rule in the satellite countries, and have asserted considerable freedom, especially in economic and trade spheres. It is naturally hoped that soon this freedom will extend to the political sphere, thus enabling Rumanians to regain at least a part of their long-cherished freedom. This is my wholehearted wish to the Rumanian people on their independence day.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues three items which recently appeared in the press strongly supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam.

The first item is an article by the distinguished columnist David Lawrence,

9776

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 11, 1965

which appeared in the Washington Star for April 28, 1965.

Mr. Lawrence quite accurately points out that the difficulties which are hampering the administration are for the most part in the psychological field. He said:

What is said on the floor of Congress about quitting the war in Vietnam, is promptly relayed and given overemphasis abroad.

In responding to those "who would prefer to see their own Government make peace at any price," Mr. Lawrence quoted this unchallengeable paragraph from President Johnson's statement:

From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace.

The second item I wish to call to my colleagues attention is an editorial in the Houston Chronicle of April 29, 1965. Commenting on the President's speech, the Chronicle said that "he took to the field to contain critics, at home and abroad, of what he called 'a crucial struggle' in southeast Asia." The editorial went on to say that—

The President intends to carry the debate to the critics, challenging their premises and answering their demands for negotiations. Equally plain, he shows no inclination to back peddle from his resolve to stand firm until and unless North Vietnam desists from its attacks in the South—or openly accepts his offer to parley.

The third item to which I refer in my opening remarks is a column by Mr. Kenneth Crawford in Newsweek for May 10, 1965, captioned "Kidding the Kids."

Mr. Crawford is tolerant of the student demonstrators against Vietnam.

It would be unrealistic to expect youth to learn from the experience of age.

Said Mr. Crawford—
Each new generation must learn for itself, and from its own experience, not from example or preaching.

But the distinguished Newsweek columnist is not so tolerant of the faculty members and academicians who are joining the students in these demonstrations or even inciting them to demonstrate.

Unless the learned are incapable of learning from events—

Said Mr. Crawford—
professors should know from the world's experience during the last quarter century that wars are not prevented by running away from aggressors during the early stages of an aggression. They do the student no service by cloaking his aversion to jungle war in the habiliments of idealism.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point the three items to which I referred in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 28, 1965]

PRESIDENT DRAMATIZES PEACE ISSUE
(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson felt that it was necessary to reiterate the American Government's

desire for peace negotiations to end the Vietnam war, so he used a televised press conference yesterday—especially called for the occasion—to dramatize the issue.

There is no doubt that the situation in southeast Asia is causing anxiety and a feeling throughout this country that the war might be widened as well as lengthened. Johnson is well aware of the apprehensions that emerge as young men and their parents begin to wonder if troops will be required in larger numbers. So the President is wisely explaining the Vietnam problem to the American people even though repeating what he has said many times before.

The United States finds itself criticized as an aggressor by the Communist countries, and it is necessary to emphasize the truth. This is that the Communists are continuing their aggression in South Vietnam despite opportunities to settle the war by a peace conference. As the President says, there can be an end to the war and a peace agreement the moment the Communist countries decide not to send troops and supplies from North Vietnam into South Vietnam.

Johnson is careful to point out that the United States has no alternative to the bombing of bridges and supply lines in North Vietnam. The President stressed the fact that the bombing is being conducted primarily against bridges and installations and that there is a minimum loss of life. The United States, therefore, is not waging a war in which it is going to extremes. In fact, Johnson ruled out any possibility of using nuclear weapons to achieve the present objectives and declared at his press conference that no steps involving nuclear weapons had ever been suggested by anybody in the Government here.

The whole purpose of the administration is to present to the other peoples of the world a true exposition of American policy in Vietnam so that public opinion everywhere will begin to put pressure on both Communist China and the Soviet Union to initiate the necessary steps to withdraw their guerrilla henchmen from South Vietnam.

To a certain extent the President is also aiming at critics in this country who seem indifferent to the high principles of American policy and who would prefer to see their own Government make peace at any price. While such a course has never repressed the appetite of aggressors, appeasement, if not virtual surrender on the main issues involved, seems nevertheless to be advocated, in effect, even by a few Members of Congress. Some of these spokesmen evidently believe that an uninformed public regards the issue as one-sided and that the only thing to do for political reasons is to speak up on the pacifist side.

Past experience, however, shows that an adversary interprets such an attitude as a reflection of the unwillingness of a nation to fight. The President said:

"From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

The risk today is that the enemy may come to believe that, if the war can be prolonged, the United States will grow weary of the conflict and, in the case of Vietnam, withdraw her forces and abjectly surrender.

Johnson realizes the danger of such a misinterpretation and takes every opportunity to remove it. He has declared again that the United States will be glad to talk peace without requiring any conditions in advance. But he says the United States will not cease to use military force to protect the people of South Vietnam in the meantime and, in fact, until there is a peace arrangement which can be trusted to be effective.

Most of the difficulties are in the psychological field. What is said on the floor of Congress about quitting the war in Vietnam

is promptly relayed and given overemphasis abroad. The President pointedly referred in his press conference to the almost universal approval that has come from our allies since he made a comprehensive statement of policy in his recent address at Johns Hopkins University. He said he didn't think America had lost any friends because of a firmness in policy. He might have added that, among the governments which had not expressed any opinions publicly, there is a feeling that the United States is really fighting a war in behalf of all the smaller nations of the world, any one of which might become the victim of aggression if the Vietnam conflict turns into a victory for the aggressors.

A major principle of far-reaching consequence to world peace is really at stake. It is a source of much satisfaction to peace-loving peoples in all parts of the world that the United States is emerging as the champion of smaller nations under attack even though the United Nations has taken no protective steps and no other major nation has actually joined America in its military mission in Vietnam.

L.B.J. DEFENDS VIETNAM POLICY AND CARRIES DEBATE TO HIS CRITICS

In his televised news conference Tuesday, President Johnson interpolated an old axiom—that the best defense of American policy in Vietnam is a strong, take-charge offense. He took to the field to contain critics, at home and abroad, of what he called a crucial struggle in southeast Asia.

The President underlined both this country's determination not to tuck our tails and run home and abandon our friends as well as his oft-repeated readiness for peace.

His recollection of Munich, a city whose name has become synonymous with appeasement, echoed what John F. Kennedy had said during the Cuban missile crisis.

President Johnson said that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats. President Kennedy said that "the 1930's taught us * * * aggressive conduct, if allowed to go unchecked and unchallenged, ultimately leads to war."

Mr. Johnson spurned the idea that the term "appeaser" could be appropriately applied to those who take issue with his policy. "We want honest, forthright discussion in this country," he said, "and that means discussion with differences of view."

This should cool the temper of the Vietnam debate which has degenerated to epithets that, to the President, both compounds and confounds the issues. But Mr. Johnson intends—along with his Secretaries of State and Defense to carry the debate to the critics, challenging their premises and answering their demands for negotiations. Equally plain, he shows no inclination to back peddle from his resolve to stand firm until and unless North Vietnam desists from its attacks in the south—or openly accepts his offer to parley.

In short, he is calling the signals to prosecute national objectives in Vietnam, as he sees them. Critics can (and ought to) argue, entreat, and dissent, but he is the playmaker—the loneliest and weightiest job in the free world.

KIDDING THE KIDS

(By Kenneth Crawford)

It would be unrealistic to expect youth to learn from the experience of age. Each new generation must learn for itself, and from its own experience, not from example or preaching. Why then should anyone be surprised that a vocal segment of the student population is protesting President Johnson's policies in southeast Asia? Why should a bright college student, eager to start a civilian career, be attracted by the prospect of soldiering in Asia? Yet this is the prospect he will face if the limited war now

May 11, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9777

going on in Vietnam becomes prelude to big war.

His reluctance is understandable. What is not so understandable is the guidance he is getting from many faculty members at teach-ins and from academicians marketing their advice on National policy to journals of opinion. Unless the learned are incapable of learning from events, professors should know from the world's experience during the last quarter century that wars are not prevented by running away from aggressor during the early stages of an aggression. They do the student no service by cloaking his aversion to jungle war in the habiliments of idealism.

FACTS ARE FACTS

That is what they are doing when they equate denunciation of bombing raids against North Vietnam with the cause of civil rights in the United States. That is what they are doing when they suggest that an American plane dropping bombs on a North Vietnamese bridge or on a Vietcong concentration in South Vietnam is an evil comparable with systematic terrorization of South Vietnamese villagers, 9,750 of whom were murdered or abducted by the Vietcong in 1964.

What is even less understandable is the ignorance of facts or the determination not to be influenced by facts which characterizes much of the professorial comment on Vietnam. There is, for example, the repeated assertion that the South Vietnamese Army, which has sustained more casualties per man engaged than the United States suffered in Korea, won't fight. There is the reiterated statement that the war in the south is an indigenous revolution, in no way the product of aggression from the north, which is belied by irrefutable evidence that Hanoi directs, supplies, and, increasingly, mans the insurgency. A captured document disclosed that Hanoi itself concedes: "The revolution for liberation of the south would never succeed if the [Communist] Party were not directing it."

The major premise of the teachinners seems to be that Red China's manifest destiny, given its population and resources, is to overrun southeast Asia and that to resist this movement is to defy an immutable law of nature. The same argument was made against interfering with Hitler's bid for elbow room, and against arming Turkey and Greece when Stalin menaced them—sometimes by the same scholars who are now saying that we are hopelessly overextended trying to police the world.

EAST IS EAST

Even though intervention stopped Hitler and slowed Stalin, the teachers now tell their students that intervention won't work in Asia because East is East and West is West and the Asians hate whites even more than Hindus hate Moslems of the same complexion, which is frightening if true. But if it is true, then we whites haven't much future in this world because we are a small and shrinking minority of the human race.

Within the framework of China's inevitable expansion, Dr. Hans Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, offers us comfort. Ho Chi Minh, he says, will be a Tito, somehow remaining independent of the Chinese. Just how Ho is to accomplish this is not clear. It has something to do with his Vietnamese nationalism. True, Ho hasn't the resources that protected Tito from Stalin, but Vietnam's historic dislike of China will make him free, or so Morgenthau contends.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, also has an interesting, though less important, idea. He told his teach-in audience that President Johnson is a victim of the wrong advice from the wrong people. Is it possible he doesn't know who's in charge here?

Somebody should tell the taught-in college boys of 1965 that their feeling about

Vietnam, while natural, isn't noble. Their fathers, perhaps.

GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I was shocked to read in the press, this morning, that nine Southern Governors contemplate the formation of a congressional bloc to force the Office of Education to change its guidelines for school desegregation. The bloc, to be made up of southern Members, would threaten to withhold appropriations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare unless the Office of Education agreed to slow down the pace of desegregation.

No section of the Civil Rights Act, passed last summer, received more careful scrutiny than title VI. That title, in section 601, provides:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Section 602 further provides:

Each Federal department and agency which is empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract, other than a contract of insurance or guaranty, is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability.

Congress acted decisively. There can be no question about the policy of this Nation. Under the act, the responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education is clear. The Commissioner of Education, Francis E. Keppel, and the Department would be derelict in the performance of their duty had they not acted to establish guidelines which will promptly bring about desegregation of schools receiving Federal assistance.

As the Governors' own statement declared:

This Department (Health, Education, and Welfare) is a Federal department, and the law being administered is a Federal law.

The Governors would be well advised to set about the business of compliance with the law as promptly and effectively as possible.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF PANEL ON TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, yesterday the Commerce Department released a report to the Secretary of Commerce by the Panel on Transportation Research and Development, of the Commerce Technical Advisory Board.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the panel's discussion and recommendations, relating to the problem of highway safety.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE PANEL ON TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

3. SAFETY IS AN IMPORTANT PARAMETER IN THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

One important measure of quality in any portion of the transportation system is the degree of safety with which people and goods are transported, and improvement of safety is an important problem in all forms of transportation. We have chosen however to focus attention on the role or research in highway safety only.

3.1 HIGHWAY SAFETY SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF INTENSIVE STUDY

The problem of safety in highway travel is of great national concern. The country has now reached the point where the number of traffic fatalities per year exceeds 45,000, and the number of persons permanently disabled each year exceed 200,000. The monetary cost commonly assigned to highway accidents is 1 cent per vehicle-mile traveled or a total of about \$8 billion per year. This overall cost of highway accidents in lives and in dollars is enormous, and it will increase as time goes on unless strong measures are taken.

The rate of accidents and fatalities is the product of a complex interaction involving the vehicle, the driver, the roadway, and the methods of controlling the flow of traffic. There is little systematic knowledge of how these factors interact and how they can best be adjusted to reduce the accident toll.

3.2 ACCIDENT DATA MUST BE SUBSTANTIALLY IMPROVED

For many years, the fatality rate per hundred million miles of vehicle travel declined steadily, from a high of about 25 in the early 1920's to a low of 5.2 in 1961. Since 1961, however, the rate has again risen and in 1964 it was 5.7. Although there are a number of plausible theories, there has been no systematic analysis that would explain why the long-term declining trend has been reversed.

Figures are frequently cited showing fatalities per vehicle mile or passenger mile by different modes of transportation, but the data available do not provide a useful comparison of the degree of danger involved in taking a particular kind of trip by alternative modes. For example, a transcontinental trip of 5,000 passenger miles is not comparable to 500 10-mile trips to a shopping center. But this is the type of comparison which is made when fatalities are related to passenger miles.

The procedures commonly used in reporting highway accidents do not provide reliable information about how the various factors in the driver-vehicle-highway system contribute to particular accidents. An intensive accident investigation program could bring to light the common causes of automobile accidents and could point the way to accident elimination, much as the investigation of aircraft accidents has served to reduce air accidents.

In the absence of better information and analysis, evaluation of alternative remedial measures is difficult. One would like to construct cost-benefit curves from which one could estimate the amount of additional safety to be derived from a given amount of expenditure on alternative improvements in various portions of the system. While the data necessary for such curves are not available, it is known that some improvements would lead to large gains.

3.3 AVAILABLE IMPROVEMENTS SHOULD BE MORE VIGOROUSLY PROMOTED

General use of seat belts, for example, would reduce passenger fatalities by perhaps as much as 30 percent at very low cost. Experience with four-lane, divided, limited-

9778

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 11, 1965

access highways indicates that they cut the accident rate approximately in half.

As far as we know, however, data are not available on the benefit to be achieved through strict traffic law enforcement, nor are the costs of strict enforcement readily available. Similarly, we know that compulsory vehicle inspection reduces accidents, but quantitative cost and benefit data are lacking.

Much is known about the relationship between automobile interior design and passenger injury when an accident occurs, but little is known about the relationship between vehicle characteristics, including age and quality of maintenance, and accident frequency. Automobile manufacturers have introduced many important improvements in recent years, including seat belts, padded dashes, collapsible steering wheels and improved door latches—which reduce injury—and better brakes, suspensions and handling characteristics—which reduce accidents. An intensified effort to design safer automobiles could obviously reduce the accident and injury hazard, but neither the cost of such effort nor the amount of benefit to be derived have been calculated.

Intensive study is also indicated in the field of driver training and certification procedures. Some information about different classes of drivers is available, as evidenced, for example, by differential insurance rates for youthful drivers.

The use of advanced technology for automatic scanning, communication, and control of vehicles and traffic probably offers great potential for improving safety. Closed circuit television, combined with computers and automatic signaling devices, is already being tried to improve the flow of traffic on some high-density highways and intersections. The next step may be devices to relieve the burden on the driver by giving him essential information about his route and highways and traffic conditions over his car radio. Eventually, the fully automated highway may relieve the drive of all control functions on certain kinds of trips.

Because these developments would improve the efficiency as well as the safety of highway travel, they are especially promising areas for research. Such efforts would, of course, require close cooperation between vehicle and highway designers and traffic engineers.

B-4 A MORE EFFECTIVE APPROACH IS NEEDED

The panel believes that while there is progress to be made in the safety improvement of highway design and vehicle design, and while this improvement is being pursued by the highway agencies and the industry, still far to little is known about accidents.

The Bureau of Public Roads has established the beginning of a good highway safety R. & D. program, but it is too narrow in scope and far too small to provide the major breakthroughs required. To reduce significantly an annual loss of \$8 billion will require the expenditure of sums far larger than those presently committed to the safety program.

To understand the problems and to develop effective means for coping with them we must seek the help and advice of imaginative people in a variety of fields—including automobile design, public relations, psychology, traffic engineering, and politics at local, State, and National levels.

It seems to the panel that the first step in a new program should be the assignment of a single responsibility for overall highway safety R. & D.—from data collection to public education, from highway design to determination of the political means for implementing a national effort. More specific recommendations for such a program are made hereafter.

MR. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I heartily endorse the panel's recom-

mendation that the Secretary of Commerce establish a separate highway-safety research and development program. It seems to me that the Department of Commerce is the logical agency for this job. It now does the bulk of highway-safety work at the Federal level. It builds the roads. It has close contacts with the automobile industry. It administers various programs and laws dealing with highway safety. Its Secretary is now Chairman of the Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board. Certainly it is logical to designate this agency as the key Federal traffic-safety unit. When the Secretary of Commerce testified before my subcommittee, I suggested to him just such an arrangement, but he did not appear overly enthusiastic about the prospect of heading the Federal traffic-safety effort. His "Detroit knows best" attitude that day was, in fact, disappointing. But I am confident that with this panel's backing, he will take the steps suggested.

In other respects, the report was disappointing. It pointed out gaps in our present knowledge of the highway-safety problem, but failed to indicate adequately that we do not even apply effectively what we already know. If the members of the panel wanted data, for example, on the benefits and cost of strict traffic-law enforcement, they needed only visit Connecticut. In 1955, Connecticut had a high traffic-death rate. Through strict law-enforcement measures, my State reduced the rate, until today its rate is the lowest in the Nation. Strict law enforcement works. We need to apply it now, not wait for a cost-benefit study to be completed.

With regard to vehicle design, the panel went out of its way to praise Detroit for introducing seat belts, padded dashes, collapsible steering wheels, and the like. No mention was made of the intensive public effort needed in order to get action by Detroit, or of the fact that neither padded dashes nor collapsible steering wheels are standard equipment today. I did not expect criticism of Detroit from the members of this distinguished panel, but I did not think they would go so far as to give the automobile makers an excuse for inaction because the "cost-benefit ratio" of safer car design has not yet been calculated. It has been calculated by the public. We want action, and we want it now. It is hoped that Detroit will voluntarily turn its many talents to the building of a safer—instead of a "hotter"—car. If that is not done, public action will be required in order to insure the development of safer cars.

I'M WYOMING

MR. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming is this year celebrating the 75th anniversary of her entry into the Union of States. In 75 short years, Wyoming has moved from a sparsely populated mining and farming territory to a State which today lays proud claim to having produced the first woman Governor in the Nation. Wyoming has the lowest illiteracy rate in the world, no bonded indebtedness, a fine highway system, and we host the largest missile base

in the world. We call ourselves the land of high altitude and low multitude.

A count of Wyoming's many "firsts" was taken by a longtime Wyoming booster, Larry Birleff, writing in a recent issue of the Cheyenne, Wyo., Eagle.

Mr. Birleff, a noted sportscaster and commentator, and a man I have long known as a valued and trusted friend, is manager of Cheyenne's radio station KFBC. He says of Wyoming:

But I'm proudest of my people, my prize possession. Many of my "younguns" leave, and many come back. Those who don't seem to always have a special place in their hearts for me. I'm proud of the fact that even the folks back in the days before my country took me in have always had a special allegiance that even Texas can't match.

I hope you'll forgive me this morning for being so immodest and taken to all kinds of bragging. But you see this is my birthday. I'm only 75 years young and in a way I feel that things may be just beginning. I'm Wyoming.

I have invited my colleagues to participate in the Equality State's diamond jubilee, and I have received many favorable replies. This excellent column by Mr. Birleff will, perhaps, explain a few more reasons for going West to participate in Wyoming's diamond jubilee.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LARRY BIRLEFF SAYS: AND MANY HAPPY RETURNS, BUDDY

I'm kidded a lot. They tell me that Montana, Colorado, South Dakota, Idaho, Utah, and Nebraska first took what they wanted and left me with what was left right in the middle. Many of the folks in America know very little about me, some care less and some think like the funny chap on TV who says, "there is no such place."

Most of the kids and maybe most of the grownups think of me only as a place where there are cowboys and Indians; others for rodeos, wind and snow, and blizzards and lots and lots of prairie grass that bends with the wind.

At first some people don't like me. They shake their heads in compassion at some of my people who live here. Then there are those who leave and come back. I'm in their blood and there is a special kind of loyalty that may be hard for others to understand.

The image I mention is hard to escape. I'm proud of my heritage and my past. I became the first haven, the first point of no return for America's real pioneers who carved out the new world as the wagon trains plodded across my plains.

I served as the first bastion for the pioneers. Today I serve as the bastion for the entire free world as the first site of the intercontinental ballistic missile.

I'm not given to boastin' but I can give you facts bigger than Texas can. Not one of my sisters can quite claim all these things. I am among the leaders in oil, wool, sheep, cattle. Produce more uranium than anybody. Produce more than 11 million board feet of lumber a year for the sawmills out of my forests. I have an acre for every three people. My winters, some folk complain about, furnishes the watersheds and snowfall for three main rivers of America nourishing millions in 12 different States.

I have 20,000 miles of the best fishing in the world, the largest elk and antelope herd in North America and the best and longest four-lane highways per capita in the good old U.S.A. My schools are second to none